

ARLINGTON VA 22209

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/272,353 03/19/99 IKEDA 500.37035X00 **EXAMINER** 020457 IM22/0605 ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS THERKORN, E SUITE 1800 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET

1723

DATE MAILED:

06/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	09/272, 353 I Ked a
Office Action Summary	Examiner Group Art Unit
•	There KORN 1723
Responsive to communication(s) filed on March 19, 1999; April 7, 1999; & Sept 23, 1999.	
☐ This action is FINAL.	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 30day, month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).	
Disposition of Claims X Claim(s) - 2	is/are pending in the application.
•	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
Claim(s)	
☐ Claim(s)	
Claim(s)	,is/are objected to.
\square Claims $1-2/$	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is bpproved disapproved.
\square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).	
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been	
received.	
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not received:	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).	
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	
□ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES	

Application/Control Number: 09/272,353 Page 2

Art Unit: 1723

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-8, drawn to various chips, classified in class 210, subclass 198.2.

II. Claims 9-21, drawn to a five processes to form structural elements, classified in class 210, subclass 656.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed could be made by each of the five distinct processes of Invention II.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

In addition to the restriction requirement, the following election of species is required if applicant elects the invention of Group I.

ELECTION I

Application/Control Number: 09/272,353

Art Unit: 1723

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: The element of claims 1-3 and 7-8 and the element of claims 4-6 are considered to be distinct species.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is considered to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/272,353

Art Unit: 1723

In addition to the restriction requirement, the following election of species is required if applicant elects the invention of Group II.

ELECTION II

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Each of the processes of claims 9-12, claims 13-15, claim 16, claim 17, and claims 18-21 are considered to be distinct species.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is considered to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1723

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to E. Therkorn at telephone number (703) 308-0362.

Ernest G. Therkorn Primary Examiner Art Unit 1723 Page 5

EGT/11 June 1, 2000